

Application No.: 10/691,389  
Amendment dated August 22, 2006  
Office Action dated January 20, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 22 2006

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11-13, 18, 19, 21, 24-27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahadev et al. (U.S. 2004/0087253) ("Mahadev"). Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahadev. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14-17, 20, 22, 23 and 28-30 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 18 to contain the limitations of dependent claims 2 and 19. Independent claims 1 and 18 in their amended form contain the limitation "wherein said edge blending is by directional oscillation of said sliders with respect to said lapping tape." Independent claim 31 contains a similar limitation. The office action does not cite to where Mahadev teaches directional oscillation. In fact, Mahadev makes no mention of oscillation of any kind. The office action states that "the edge blending is performed by relative movement or directional oscillation between the sliders 205b and the lapping tape 203" but there appears to be no support for this statement in the text of the publication. The mere fact that Mahadev mentions movement cannot properly be construed as teaching oscillation. Additionally, the movement mentioned in Mahadev is movement of the tape and not the slider.

For at least the above reasons, applicants assert that these amendments place independent claims 1, 18, and 31 in an allowable form, and that dependent claims 3-17 and 20-30 are allowable as depending from allowable independent claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/691,389  
Amendment dated August 22, 2006  
Office Action dated January 20, 2006

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: August 22, 2006

By: 

Jeffrey R. Joseph  
(Reg. No. 54,204)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501

88877.1